

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, and 20-24 will remain pending in this application. Claims 2, 8, 14 and 24 are hereby canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 00/59150 ("Peinado"). Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding rejections.

### ***Interview Summary***

Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Beemnet Dada participated in a telephonic interview on March 5, 2007 to discuss the above claim amendments. Examiner Dada stated that the above claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the specification fails to mention "without first receiving an explicit request to obtain the license" that was previously recited in the independent claims. Applicants do not necessarily agree with this allegation. However, Applicants feel that the language "transparent to the recipient" better describes the claimed subject matter, and Applicants have inserted this language into the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 00/59150 ("Peinado"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 recite that, in response to receiving and recognizing protected content, a license for the protected content is obtained from an RM

server. The recognizing and obtaining are performed in a manner transparent to a recipient of the email.

Peinado discloses that a license may be obtained to decrypt and access protected content. However, Peinado explicitly discloses that the license is obtain in response to a license request (Peinado, Pg. 32, l. 6). Thus, for example, in Peinado's system, a user presumably has to spend the time to review a document and to determine that the document includes protected content. Additionally, for example, if a network connection has expired before the user can review the document, then it may not even be possible to obtain the license at the time the license request is received.

Accordingly, Peinado does not teach or suggest "whereby said recognizing and obtaining are performed in a manner transparent to a recipient of the email," as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are not anticipated by Peinado. Applicants further submit that claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18 and 21-24 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Claims 2, 8, 14 and 24 are hereby canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 302766.1 / MSFT-2154  
**Application No.:** 10/607,896  
**Office Action Dated:** June 18, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: September 18, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439